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Writing Gifted Baby Cyprus: Ethnic Motherland Nationalist Literatures

Bahriye Kemal

This article assigns the literary as the preferred means to write Cyprus because it exposes the power of place and space in postcolonial partitioned cases; it exposes that spatial production determines the formation and agency of identity in Cyprus, which serves to sharpen and to blur the dominant binary legacy of historical-political deadlock discourse, so to generate conflict and solidarity between the deeply divided people in postcolonial partitioned Cyprus.

The focus is on the Greek-cypriot and Turkish-cypriot nationalist identification that dominated throughout the last decades of British colonial and into postcolonial Cyprus. This is an examination of the ethnic motherland nationalist literatures, with emphasis on capturing the ways the writers actively write, read and construct the dominant production of Cyprus. Here exposing that even though the nationalists’ writings are based on deeply competing narratives, they have used the same processes and practices to produce a Cyprus for their ethnic selves. This spatial competition and solidarity will be examined through various empirical-theoretical spatial approaches, with emphasis on illuminating the postcolonial and partitioned inventions of gendered nationalism, through making use of Yi-Fu Tuan’s healthy balance between experiencing place and space and Henri Lefebvre’s spatiology. The article demonstrates the shared ways the nationalist writers attempt to produce an ethnically homogeneous mental place through two gendered processes—maternal principle and ancestral journeys operating with fetish spectacles, objects and substances—that manipulate social, historical and spatial practices to make the abstract nation appear concrete. This place is thus depicted as a Gift from the Mothers to the children of Cyprus and as Baby Cyprus.

Cyprus; Literature; Place/Space; Anti-Colonialism; Gendered Nationalism
Cyprus’ political and cultural history of colonisation, partition and conflicting identities is an issue of place and space. Between west and east or north and south, Cyprus is a strategically located Mediterranean island that has always been in the process of production. As example Piri Reis’s ([1521] 2013) Ottoman Cyprus map in *Kitab-I Bahriye (Book of the Sea / Navigation)*, Herbert Kitchener’s first comprehensive 1878-1881 British Cyprus map (Shirley 2001), the 1950s-1960s anti-colonial competing movements that remapped a Turkey-Cyprus or Greece-Cyprus, and the 1974 geographical partition that is an affair of lands and properties. This processual status shows Cyprus's pivotal significance to those experiences with place and space that have come to define postcolonial and partition studies, yet Cyprus has been neglected by postcolonial and partition scholars. Here I am pointing particularly towards the Turcophone, Hellenophone and Anglophone literatures of Cyprus that have been neglected in a national and international domain; here I am suggesting that the literary must be assigned as the preferred means to write Cyprus because it is a complementary narrative that reveals the power of place and space in postcolonial partitioned cases like Cyprus.

Few things have been written on Cyprus and its people from a postcolonial and partition literary perspective; however, there have been various initiatives towards such understanding. In recent years, scholars and writers from Cyprus have proposed the term “Cypriot Literatures” as writings by “Greek-Cypriots, Turkish-Cypriots, Armenian-Cypriots, Greeks, Turks and Brits; a multilingual, uncanonical and minor literature positioned between the cultural history and geography of Cyprus, Greece, Turkey and Briton” (Kappler 2007; Stephanides 2007; Yasin 1999, 2000). Hence triggering a new bicomunal and transnational literary turn against the nationalist turn that divides, defines and dominates postcolonial Cyprus. Studies on Cyprus from a postcolonial perspective are emerging, with some writings by literary scholars and most by anthropologist. Studies from a partition perspective are mostly anthropological, political (Loizides 2007) and geo-political studies (Atan 2003; Bianchini et al. 2006; Calame 2012) with limited literary studies (Layouni 2001; Pércopo 2001). A common theme within and between these initiatives is place and space, yet this has not been addressed. Thus, this much-welcomed coverage prompted the first comprehensive study of the literatures of Cyprus from a postcolonial and partitioned perspective met with spatial considerations (Kemal 2013); this article draws, adds and is shaped by this emerging body of work.

This article provides a platform for the nationalist literatures of Cyprus to demonstrate that the production of place and space determines the formation and agency of identity in Cyprus; here exposing the ways that spatial production serves to sharpen and to blur the dominant binary legacy of historical-political deadlock discourse, which gives way to conflict and solidarity between a people who have been geographically divided and defined for decades. The name used to define the people in Cyprus is political: identity formation and naming changes as self and spatial conception changes, which operates as a contest within and between “Turkish and Greek”, the dominant right-wing nationalist identification that ideologically divides the people, and “Cypriot”, an emergent left-wing identification with a “structure of feeling” towards unifying the people. This article will highlight the significance of this name game, particularly through using the official name “Greek-cypriot” and “Turkish-cypriot” to demonstrate the nationalist identification and position; here “cypriot” is lower case because for the nationalists this identification is insignificant and does not need to exist. The focus is on the Greek-cypriot and Turkish-cypriot nationalists, what has come to be called the ethnic motherland nationalistic identification, that dominated throughout the last decades of British colonial and into postcolonial Cyprus. This examination captures the ways the ethnic motherland nationalist writers actively write, read and construct the dominant production of Cyprus. Here exposing that even though the nationalists’ writings are based on deeply competing spatial narratives, they have used the same processes and practices to produce a Cyprus for their ethnic selves. This spatial competition and solidarity will be examined through various empirical-theoretical spatial approaches, with emphasis on illuminating the postcolonial and partitioned inventions of gendered nationalism, through making use of Yi-Fu Tuan’s (1977) perspectives of experiencing place and space coupled with Henri Lefebvre’s (1991) spatiology.

Several writers who represent the ethnic motherland nationalist definitions of Cyprus, and who are pioneers of the “1950s Nationalist Generation” will be explored, with focus on works by the Greek-cypriot writers Costas Montis and Claire Angelides, and the Turkish-cypriot writers Ozker Yasin and Suleyman Ulucamgil. These writers are considered amongst the national writers of Cyprus.
because of their influential contributions to the political and cultural history of the anti-colonial struggle in 1955-1960, the independence failures in the 1960s, and the results of geographical partition in 1974. These nationalist writers not only recorded but served and shaped these nationalising moments, by being committed members of the anti-colonial movements, and/or having official governmental positions upon independence and partition, which provided the dominant meaning and production of Cyprus.

**Name Game: Greek, Turkish, Cypriot Identification**

“Greek”, “Turkish”, “Cypriot” have been subject to a name game, like the partitioned contest of number games (Appadurai 1996; Cohn 1987), that provides cultural and national definition in Cyprus. This contest is not only between people from different ethnic communities, but more between people from the same ethnic community with divisions over the dominant and emergent socio-political positions—British colonizer and colonized, the nationalist Right and communist Left, parents and children—looming large throughout colonial and postcolonial Cyprus.

“Greek and Turkish” have been the dominant names used by the nationalists to define and divide the people through Greece or Turkey; this is called ethnic motherland nationalism (Loizides 2007). During this period, “Cypriot” emerged as an alternative to replace Greekness or Turkishness with a Cypriotness towards an island unification and patriotism; this is called Cypriotism (Loizides 2007) framed around two political agendas. From the 1930s the British usage of “Cypriot” took force to de-ethnicize the islanders into Anglo-Cypriot loyal subjects of the Empire, against the separate anti-colonial ethnic-nationalisms developing at the time. This Cypriotisation, which was implemented in the pedagogical reforms (Spyridakis 1956; Persianis 1996) and the governmental press releases overseen by the Public Information Office director and writer, Lawrence Durrell (1954-56) (Durrell 1954-56; 1998; MacNiven 1998; Calotychos 2003), gave way to contest between the British and islanders, ending in the failure of Colonial-Cypriotism and rejection of the name “Cypriot”. In the same period, “Cypriot” was proposed by the communists—beginning with “The Communist Party of Cyprus” (KKK) enhanced by “Progressive Party of Working People” (AKEL) and adopted by “Republic Turkish Party” (CTP) (Adams 1971; *Turkish Cypriot Political Parties* 1989) – as an unofficial “structure of feeling” towards a united front with and for all working people of Cyprus. Upon independence “Cypriot” gained some precedence, where it continued to operate as a leftist move towards a Cypriotism against ethnic nationalism, but never became official in its own political terms and subsequently lost its communist stance. The on-going contest, often ending in “Greek and Turkish” dominance over “Cypriot” emergence, gave way to a third name, “Turkish-Cypriot and Greek-Cypriot”, which is currently official and standardised mostly with a hyphen that prioritises the first part –ethnic aspirations of community – of this name; this is “Turkish-Cypriotism and Greek-Cypriotism” (Loizides 2007).

This name game is illuminated further in the literatures of Cyprus, particularly the postcolonial contest over using “Greek Literature and Turkish Literature” or “Cypriot Literatures” (Papaleontiou and Constantine, 2007; Yasin 1999), ending in the former being dominant in the divided national curricula. It is also reflected in the separately standardised literary moves: the “1950-1974 Generation” focuses on colonial and anti-colonial moments, with the dominant “1950s Nationalist Generation” of poets Yasin, Montis and Ulucamgil, who write Cyprus and its people through Greekness of Greece or Turkishness of Turkey. The “1974-1990 Generation” focuses on partition, and is made up of two strands: on one side the marginalised Cypriotists, with the “74 Generation” pioneered by Mehmet and Nese Yashin, children of nationalist Yasin, who oppose their literary forefathers by rewriting Cyprus through a Cypriotness. The Cypriotists set the foundation for a bicomunal literary turn enhanced by the diaspora into a transnational literary turn, where they actively play and protest, as is enhanced in this article, against the rules of the name game by destandardising, defixing and disturbing their names into cypriots, Cypriotturks, cypriotgreek and so on, to expose the processual nature of identity in colonial and postcolonial Cyprus proper nouns and names but processual identifications that lead to improper circumstances. On the other side is the dominant Turkish-Cypriotists and Greek-Cypriotists, who prioritise Turkishness or Greekness of the cypriot community; this group consists of figures from the “1950s Nationalist Generation” enhanced through literary figures, like Angelides, who together maintain the principles of the ethnic motherland nationalist to read and construct Cyprus.
Competing Narratives in Spatial Solidarity

The ethnic motherland nationalist identification, which dominated throughout the last decades of British colonial and into postcolonial partitioned Cyprus, is built on the foundation of deeply competing narratives, yet its formation has been shared by the Greek-cypriots and Turkish-cypriots. As Neophyto Loizides states, the ethnic motherland nationalist identification is determined by “perceptions of common origin and history with Turkey or Greece” (2007, 173-174); it is determined by spatially.

Greek-cypriots and Turkish-cypriots shared spatial approaches toward British Cyprus, whereby their respective anti-colonial movements struggled to un-invent British contamination to pre-invent and re-invent liberated Cyprus. The Greek-cypriot movement “National Organization of Cypriot Fighters” (EOKA) founded in 1955 simultaneously fought against the British and for enosis—a unionist demand aspiring to unite with Greece. EOKA for most Greek-cypriot nationalists is defined as an armed struggle against British colonialism, whilst for the Turkish-cypriots it is a terrorist move that ethnically cleansed Turkish-cypriots from the land. The Turkish-cypriot movement “Turkish Resistance Association” (TMT) commenced in 1958 and mobilized in 1963 against colonialism and for taksim—a separatist demand aspiring union with Turkey. TMT for the Turkish-cypriot nationalists is a rival national movement to defend their ethnic community from EOKA and to resist by deception the British administration, for Greek-cypriot nationalists it is a terrorist organisation that was a marker of the Turkish-cypriot demand for partition and collaboration with the British. Such competing narratives, are intensified through shared approaches towards liberation, whereby liberated Cyprus for one ethnic community is enslavement for the other community. The Greek-cypriots write Ottoman rule, taksim, the 1974 partition and Turkish presence as major factors of Cyprus’s enslavement; un-inventing the island of such inscriptions, and pre-inventing it with ancient Greek origins to re-invent enosis is their liberated Cyprus. These Turkish factors are emphasised by the Turkish-cypriots, while the Greek-cypriot ethnic inscriptions that contribute to Turkish-cypriot enslavement are emptied from their liberated Cyprus. Liberation for the nationalists means an ethnically homogeneous Greek or Turkish Cyprus, which not only focuses on Cyprus but more specifically maps Greece or Turkey within the definition and construction of the nation.

This decolonial process of national construction can be understood through making use of Lefebvre’s and Tuan’s useful and useable spatial approaches. Lefebvre’s spatiology offers a method, defined as a “regressive-progressive” approach, with nine interrelated spaces that provides people with the agency to capture the concrete-abstractions within and for the “production of space”, so within and for the actual reading and construction. Tuan focuses on ways tenants of the world can have a vigorous relationship with the environment, particularly through having a healthy balance between the experience of “space”, which is openness, freedom and danger, and “place”, which is closed, secure and complete. In support of these spatial approaches, the nationalist writers reclaim their rights to experience, read and construct Cyprus. In this decolonial moment of resistance and recovery, the nationalists adopt what I call the postcolonial and partition processes of “invention” – un-inventing by emptying the colonial world and ethnically cleansing the Others’ world to pre-invent ethno-religious origins and re-invent an ethnically complete body – determined by a gendered nationalism that replaces open zones with closed zones, which gives the nationalists total knowledge and command of Cyprus. Rebecca Bryant’s “The Purity of Spirit and the Power of Blood” (2004) provides an understanding of this gendered nationalism, which operates with specific substances – while the Greek-cypriots’ substance is the ancient Greek spirit attributed with purity, the Turkish-cypriots’ is Ottoman Turkish blood associated with power – that are naturalised in the land through the way they “prove” them as “historical” and “biological facts”. Bryant’s illuminating study will be expanded upon throughout this article.

It is through Lefebvre and Tuan that this decolonial process of invention is read, constructed experienced and exposed as and through a “regressive-progressive” approach based on past-present movements that intertwine, with the former telescoped into the latter so interrupting and obscuring it (Lefebvre, 67), which in turn captures the dialectics between concrete-abstract and place-space within and for the production of Cyprus. This is an abstract mental place, which manipulates concrete social and historical time and space, to make the abstract political and national space appear a concrete
place. This is an ethnically homogenised “mental space whose dual function is to reduce ‘real’ space [i.e. social, lived and historical space] to the abstract and to induce minimal difference” (Lefebvre 1991, 398), experienced as a Tuanian place through attachments, kinship, awareness and knowledge of the environment. Tuan’s and Lefebvre’s definitions of the nation illuminate further that this is a mental process—which is, in Tuan’s words, determined by “symbolic means to make the large national state seem a concrete place – not just a political idea – toward which a people could feel deep attachment […] based on direct experience and intimate knowledge” (111-112), and, as Lefebvre defines, a sort of natural substance that has matured within historical and social time, or an ideological imagining projected onto historical and social time (176-177) – that creates the illusion of a concrete bodily place. The gender principle plays a significant role in this illusionary construction of the nation: while Tuan explores gendering as a symbolic means that captures deep kinship between people and their environment to create “place”; Lefebvre explores space as carved into male or female bodies to secrete peoples’ agency and/or the abstractions in the reading and construction of the nation.

Through making use of these useful and useable spatial approaches this article will expand upon the ways these competing narratives pave solidarity. Here revealing the shared ways, the ethnic motherland nationalist invent, experience and conceive an ethnically homogeneous mental place through two gendered processes that make the abstract nation appear concrete. The starting point for this reading and construction of place is the mother; in the nationalist discourse Greece and Turkey are the Mothers, and the narratives attempt to prove this maternal kinship as biological fact through elaborating on the deep attachment between Mother Greece or Mother Turkey and Baby Cyprus. This is developed further through narratives about the process by which the Mothers gave ethnic birth to Cyprus; here showing knowledge of the Mothers’ Journey—the Ancestral Journey—to Cyprus, which is conceived through organising historical, social and spatial practices into fetish spectacles and objects operating with a blood or spiritual substance. Thus, these processes and practices produce a Gift from the Mothers to the children of Cyprus, and as Baby Cyprus.

Mother and Baby

The literary depictions of Mother Greece and Mother Turkey give way to narratives of Baby Cyprus, and this maternal principle is often introduced within the context of EOKA or TMT. Costas Montis’s Closed Doors ([1964]2004) is a recording of the EOKA liberation struggle, which writes back to Lawrence Durrell, a British writer and officer who served in British Cyprus from 1954-1956, and who wrote about the EOKA campaign in Bitter Lemons (1957). In Closed Doors, Montis immortalizes the anti-colonial case of Cyprus from a Greek-cypriot perspective, through his protagonist, a Greek-cypriot schoolboy, who narrates the EOKA campaign as experienced in Nicosia. In the opening of the novella the narrator states:

the long-standing struggle of the island to shake off the foreign yoke, an unbroken effort that had taken many forms, all peaceful […] we children […] accepted the mild level of protest as customary, traditional even. It had been closely interwoven into our lives since birth. Until that fateful (fateful?) January (3)

The passage demonstrates that throughout colonial rule, by British as well as previous rulers, the Greek-cypriots had been mild and weak in protesting against colonial enslavement. The narrator’s emphasis that “we children” were born into this mildness, and accepted this as “tradition”, suggests that the Greek children of Cyprus were losing sense of the meaning of ethnic tradition and heritage by accepting weakness and enslavement as their traditional or habitual state. The narrator shows, however, that the mobilization of EOKA in January 19559 changed the history of enslavement, and awoke the Greek-cypriots to rid the island of British rule and fight for liberation. The narrator clearly states the term that defined this liberation, which suggests that “we children” simultaneously refers to the actual Greek-cypriot child and the island:

“Enosis,” a demand for liberation that echoed from time to time as the ultimate aspiration of every Greek territory outside of the borders of the free motherland (4)

“Enosis” was liberation. Greece is the “motherland”, and Cyprus is represented as a Greek territory that is geographically separate but with aspirations to unify with Greece; this suggests that Cyprus,
like all Greek islands, is the child of Mother Greece. Such maternal representations of Mother Greece and her Baby Cyprus were frequently used in literary and political representation, and throughout the resistance EOKA recited it in hymns. Christodoulos Papachrysostomou’s poem “EOKA Hymn” is a momentous example of this gendered kinship, because it was an inspirational poem sung by the EOKA fighters during their imprisonment in colonial detention camps: “Onward, onward, EOKA calls/ and may the earth thunder beneath your feet, […] mother Hellas waits to crown/ all her children with laurel wreaths” (2003, 71).

Similarly, in Turkish-cypriot narratives, Turkey is the motherland and Cyprus the “babyland”. In his poetry collection Letter of Cyprus ([1958] 1986), Yasin attempts to immortalize the first Turkish-cypriot anti-colonial mobilization on 27-28 January 1958 towards a taksim liberation, which is a milestone frequently recorded in Turkish-cypriot resistance narratives. Yasin’s is a particularly good example of the gendered associations related to this significant struggle. Letter of Cyprus is a narrative between two friends communicating by letter, which is also reflected in the poem’s form. The first section is written in letter form, a poetic letter dated “29 January 1958” and addressed to a Turkish-cypriot from a Turkish citizen. In this poetic letter, the Turkish citizen questions his Turkish-cypriot friend on the anti-colonial events of “27 January 1958”, which he read about in Turkish newspapers. The remaining sections of the Letter of Cyprus are divided into seven poems, all of which are a Turkish-cypriot reply to the letter from the Turkish friend. The first section is symbolic of Turkey, and suggests a letter from the mother who confirms awareness of the Turkish-cypriot struggles, which Yasin elaborates on in reply poem “II”:

We would say that in the motherland
The officials sat around a table
We heard that our future would be a subject.
[…]
We knew our Turkey
We knew our mother eagle
Would not leave its orphaned baby on its own (106)

Here, Cyprus is defined as the “orphaned baby” because it has been separated from its Mother Turkey, and has been lacking the freedom to fly; this maternal separation resonates with the dominant narratives regarding the events of 1914 when the Ottoman-British agreement lapsed, and more so after 1924 when Cyprus was officially named a British crown colony.

Montis, Papachrysostomou and Yasin are just three examples of the numerous nationalist writers who represent Greece or Turkey as the Mother and Cyprus as her child, whereby the anti-colonial struggle against British rule is simultaneously a struggle that seeks to re-unite Cyprus, the vulnerable Baby, with its Mother. The ethnic motherland nationalist gendered configurations relate to numerous postcolonial cases, where the nationalist representations of place are commonly gendered through female figures: Sumathi Ramaswamy explores India as “Mother India” or “Mother Tamil” through “bodyscapes” on the scientific map (2001); Lyn Innes explores various representations of Mother Africa and Mother Ireland (1994). Anne McClintock states, “nations are frequently figured through the iconography of familial and domestic space”, through figures such as “mothers” to emphasise that, like a family, the nation is an organic unity and a natural construction (1997, 90).

Similarly, in the ethnic motherland nationalist narratives, Greece or Turkey are figured as the Mother, and Cyprus and its people as her child, to show that together they form an organic family unit. Through such maternal associations, the nationalists expand further the experiential dimension of natural or maternal unity for the construction of national “place”. This resonates with Tuan’s notion of place as developed through the child’s actual experience with the environment: “place as a focus of value, nurture and support” which makes “the mother […] the child’s primary place” (1977, 29). The writers suggest that the people of a nation experience the national territory, like a child experiencing its mother, as the centre of intimate attachment and deep kinship that is a secure safe place. Tuan engages with actual maternal and familial experience to define place, and it is clear that these concrete social experiences are manipulated for the ethnic motherland nationalist definition of the nation.

The maternal dimension is manipulated and transformed from being the centre of social practice and active reproduction to being the centre of political abstraction and passive action, by
which the abstract nation is made concrete. For example, in the nationalist narratives the EOKA or TMT anti-colonial liberation campaign is determined by a process that replaces the social, particularly the lived relationship between mother and baby, with a political notion of enosis or taksim for the mental conception of a united concrete nation. Reading these maternal configurations of the nation through Lefebvre clarifies further the emptying of social experiences. Lefebvre states that for society to enter the process of creating appropriated social space “the principle of fertility (the Mother) undergoes renewal”, and the foundation of this social space is “prohibition […] dislocation of most immediate relationships (such as the child’s with its mother) […] prohibition, which separates the child from its mother” (34-35). The ethnic motherland nationalists and postcolonial nations generally refuse or struggle against these necessities, in that the reading and construction of the nation as a fruitful reproductive mother is steadfast, and this production is determined by uniting the mother and child. Such representations of the nation through the mother and child not only empty the social condition, they also reflect, as McClintock argues, the national hierarchy, whereby the females are figured to have the subjugated roles within the nation. In the gendered depictions of Turkey and Greece, however, there are some differences. Mother Greece and Mother Turkey are both represented as all-powerful, free and untouchable forces that control, provide and protect the children, both male and female, of Cyprus, with supremacy to liberate and unify with Cyprus. Mother Greece and Mother Turkey are not subjugated women, like the weak women McClintock and Innes point towards; however, in support of McClintock’s and Innes’s claim, it is the sons of Cyprus and particularly the motherlands that are the “active agents” who struggle and sacrifice themselves for the family, for Mother and Baby to re-unite.

Even though there are some similarities in the gendered nationalism between Cyprus and other postcolonial nations, unlike most postcolonial cases, the Turkish-cypriot and Greek-cypriot nationalists rarely define their own home, Cyprus, as the motherland but instead as the baby, whilst Greece and Turkey are always mapped as the mothers of the nation. Greece and Turkey are the mothers, creators and protectors of Greekness and Turkishness in Cyprus, which is emphasised through representations of Mother Greece’s and Mother Turkey’s ancestral journey into Cyprus.

Ancient Greek and Ottoman Journeys

The nationalist literatures are dominated by pre-inventing– a return to a primordial condition – the ancestral journey, which is used as a tool to prove that Mother Greece or Turkey gave ethnic –Greek or Turkish– birth to Baby Cyprus. Here the ancestors are the ancient Greek people from Greece, or the Ottoman Turks from Turkey who arrived and inscribed Cyprus with an ethnic substance.

The narratives of the ancestral journeys and arrival suggest “spatial awareness and knowledge” in relation to the “ancestors”, which are, as Tuan points out, central experiences for the formation of “place”. Moreover, the narratives of the journey resonate with what Lefebvre coins “spatial practices” based on “perceived” routes and routines of “users” that secrete and appropriate a society’s space; whilst the arrival and inscription points to social practices or a form of “representational space” based on directly “lived space”. The ethnic motherland nationalist narratives manipulate these notions of spatial awareness and knowledge, spatial practices and representational spaces, particularly through mental processes or a form of “representation of space” based on “conceived space” tied to relations of knowledge, order and arcane signs that control the “perceived and lived” (33, 38-39). The nationalists focus solely on antique spaces, particularly the ancient Greek or Ottoman Turkish “users”, which are based on processes that secrete and appropriate actual social, spatial and historical practices, particularly controlling and cleansing actual knowledge and routines related to lived and perceived experiences of the people in Cyprus, other ethno-religious groups, and the colonialist, which are considered contaminative. In this process, the concrete (i.e. social and lived) is reduced to the abstract (mental and conceived), which in turn enables the abstract to appear concrete. The ethnic motherland nationalist reading and construction is determined by mental abstractions, which shows “awareness and knowledge” through organising “spatial practices” – particularly ancestral journeys – and “representational spaces” or “social space” into spectacles and objects of systematisation “conceived” through a powerful blood or pure spiritual substance. Through such systemisation the ethnic motherland nationalists show total knowledge of the ancestors’ spatial
and social practices that construct the illusion of a cleansed, closed and complete ethnic place.

In *Venerable Lady The Sea* (2000), Angelides’ poems in the section entitled “Cyprus” are dominated by narratives of the ancestors’ spiritual journey and arrival for the construction of place. “The Kyrenia Ship” is a short historical-factual poem about the ancient Greek journey to Cyprus:

> It is fortunate that the Kyrenia Ship
> was found
> a living reminder, eternally,
> of the voyage of Beauty
> on the Aegean Sea
> between
> Rhodes and Cyprus. (51)

“The Kyrenia Ship” refers to the shipwreck that was discovered in the north coast of Cyprus, near Kyrenia; it was excavated in 1968-1969, and is renowned for being the only preserved ship from Greece’s classical age. Archaeological research has evidenced that the ship is from fourth century B.C.E., and analysis of excavated material – the wine amphorae in particular– confirm that both ship and cargo were Greek from Rhodes (Katzev 2007; Steffy 1985; Swiny 1973). Angelides’ poem is based on this evidence of the Kyrenia shipwreck, to represent and make fact the journey and inscription of ancient Greece in Cyprus. The poem suggests that the Greekness of Cyprus has a primordial presence, whereby the Greek ancestors travelled to Cyprus thousands of years ago, and “fortunately” for the Greek-cypriot, the ship is an ancient object that proves this as fact. Angelides reveals that this ship inhabits spiritual value and must be deeply worshipped because it not only proves the ancestral journey, but is the object from the ancestors that confirms they gave ethnic birth to Cyprus.

In “A fairy tale”, Angelides elaborates further on this Greek birth through representing the practices of the ancestors who came on this eternal ship. The Greek word for “fairy tale” is “Paramythi”, which means both fairy and folk tale, both of which have significance in the interpretation of the poem. The poem is titled “fairy tale”, not because it is considered a made-up fantasy, but because the Greek-cypriot relationship to the ancestral arrival parallels that of a child to a fairy tale; like children, the Greek-cypriots and the island have grown up with, imagined and pre-invented the ancestral arrival. The primordial arrival is simultaneously a folk tale because it speaks of the carriers of Greek customs and beliefs into Cyprus. This fairy-folk tale sets the foundation and provides evidence of the ancestral implementation of the Greek spirit in Cyprus:

> We came from very far
> holding the keels, the words
> the Greek words
> and the heart of Mnemosyne.
> […]
> we landed with our children, our women
> our old fathers.
> We built strong houses
> […]
> On shells we wrote myths and history (53)

Angelides narrates the fairy-folk tale using a personal pronoun, “we”, to show both the ancestral arrival as narrated through them, and to clarify where “we” Greek-cypriots have come from, and who “we” Greek-cypriots are: Greek-cypriots came from Greek lands, and they are the offspring of the ancient Greek ancestors who arrived in Cyprus. The poem shows that the ancestors were holding the “keels”, which indicates that they are those people who were on the Kyrenia ship, because the “keel” of this ship, though in sixteen pieces, has been excavated and noted for being in excellent condition with the whole length preserved. Angelides pluralizes the keel to also suggest the keels of all the other ancient Greek ships that have not yet been found.

Here Angelides confirms Cyprus’ ancient Greek inheritance not only through the spatial practices as evidenced by the spirit in and of the ship, but also through the ancestors’ social practices
that inscribed Greek culture and history into Cyprus. Angelides systematically orders these social practices – the family, “children, women and fathers”, brought language, “words”, and built “houses” – into objects and spectacles of the ancestors’ Greek spirit. She explores this ancestral spirit through stating that the ancestors carried the heart of “Mnemosyne”, a titanian, symbolic of the abstract personification of memory, and associated with the journey to the underworld, particularly through a river that is contrasted with the river Lethe; the souls who drank from the river Mnemosyne would remember in a state of omniscience, and those who drank from the river Lethe would forget in a state of oblivion. Through the symbolisms of Mnemosyne, Angelides immortalizes the Greek spirit in Cyprus. The ancestors brought Mnemosyne’s spirit, which suggests that they inscribed the ancient memories, particularly the culture and history, from Greece into Cyprus, and the Greek-cypriots have inherited Mnemosyne’s qualities to remember in omniscience the ancient Greek journey, arrival and creation of Cyprus. Angelides’ engagement with the Mnemosyne responds to James Notopoulos’s argument in “Mnemosyne in Oral Literature” (1938), which claims that Mnemosyne’s importance was indicated in oral literature when poets frequently referred to memory in order to recite, but as a result of written tradition, Mnemosyne was not referred to as much, and the significance of memory became less important. Angelides’ poem shows, however, that Mnemosyne and oral tradition are fundamental for Cyprus, because through them the Greek-cypriots orally narrate, remember, preserve and immortalize the fairy-tale of the ancestral construction or procreation of Greek Cyprus.

Angelides also represents this Greek spirit through elaborating further on the “houses”, particularly the concrete architectural structures, the “Greeks” built in Cyprus. In “Fate, myth and pain”, Angelides points to this ancient Greek architecture through the myth of Teucer:

in this Salamis, the seaside city

[...]

Teucer laments for this island,

his own

where he was fated to travel

pathfinder of fate,
messenger of divine oracle.

His fate, myth and pain

on this island (52)

Here, Angelides is pointing to the link between Teucer, the Greek mythological hero, and the ancient city of Salamis in Cyprus. This process of naming people and linking them to locations, resonates with Tuan’s place, enhanced through Liz Gunner’s point in “Names and the Land” (1996), which confirms that this is means to represent a people’s intimacy, familiarity, and belonging in the land. In support of this, Angelides is suggesting that the Greek-cypriots connect and belong to Salamis because their ancestor, Teucer, not only created it, but is mapped within Salamis; thus, Angelides transforms Salamis into an object that inhabits Teucer’s immortal spirit. Angelides shows, however, that “Teucer laments for this island” because “Salamis” has been occupied by the Turks since the 1974 partition; the Greek-cypriots are failing to protect the ancestors’ spirit in Cyprus.

In Closed Doors, Montis demonstrates further that the ancient Greeks mapped their spirit into Cyprus, with emphasis on the Greek-cypriots’ responsibility to protect it. Montis captures this spirit and responsibility through “language”, particularly through negotiating between the texts from the ancient Greek and EOKA struggle, which circulated and covered Cyprus:

the streets, the churches, movie theatres, schools, hotels, coffee shops, restaurants, stores, buses [...] walls, doors, windows [...] They were everywhere [...] Nicosia was full of leaflets (I am speaking of Nicosia, but it was the same in Limassol, in Famagusta, in Larnaca, in Kyrenia, in Paphos...) ([1964] 2004, 30).

The narrator shows that the EOKA texts or “leaflets” are sacred objects that are in every town and village, on every building and landscape, coating everything and everywhere; the island is re-mapped into layers of EOKA leaflets. The narrator questions the message on these leaflets: “did EOKA even write the words? No, they had already been written four thousand years earlier” (35), which suggests not only that the ancient Greeks wrote the EOKA leaflet, but that Cyprus has been covered by these
Greek inscriptions. The narrator quotes from one such leaflet: “with God’s help, with faith in the justice of the cause...” (16). The quotation itself does not refer to ancient Greek words; however, the passage is taken from an authentic EOKA leaflet, the first that was distributed on 1 April 1955, which not only introduced the Greek-cypriot masses to EOKA, but which is dominated by words from ancient Greek battles:

With God’s help, with faith in the justice of the cause
[...]  
WE START OUR FIGHT AGAINST THE BRITISH RULERS, having as a dictum what our forefathers left as a holy testament, “COME BACK WITH YOUR SHIELD OR ON YOUR SHIELD” [...]  

From the depths of the centuries, they look upon us all those who glorified Greek history, the soldiers of Marathon and Salamis, Leonidas’ 300,
[...]  
Let us show with our actions that we will surpass them (Carter. D. 2009)

The phrase, “Come back with your shield or on your shield” is from the Spartan battle, which was a farewell from the Spartan mothers to their sons, to return home either alive “with the shield” or dead “on the shield”, because it was an emblem of duty, and its loss symbolic of a coward abandoning battle. “Let us show with our actions that we will surpass them” is from the oath of the Athenian warriors, and “Marathon and Salamis” and “Leonidas 300” refer to ancient battles. In capturing these ancient Greek words and wisdom from mothers and sons of battle, the EOKA leaflet confirms that the Greek spirit of the glory days has been inscribed and immortalized in Cyprus. Here confirming that the Greek-cypriots are the offspring of the ancient Greeks; here validating that they have not only inherited the heroism of their ancestors to fight for ethnic glory, but it is their duty to protect this Greek lineage in Cyprus. Furthermore, the leaflet points to the ancient Greek gaze – “look” – that expects the Greek-cypriot offspring to use this ancient Greek inheritance, protect the ancestral Greekness of Cyprus, and win this Modern Greek battle.

Angelides and Montis represent deep knowledge and awareness of the ancient Greeks’ spatial and social practices – particularly the journey depicted through the ship, and arrival through family, architecture, houses and language – that invested the Greek spirit in Cyprus, which are considered as gifts created by the ancestors for the Greek-cyriots. This spiritual process of production simultaneously transforms Cyprus into a Gift, the offspring procreated by the ancestors of Mother Greece, which is an eternal Greek place. Such gendered reading and construction is what moulded the nationalist of Cyprus to call out, as Montis writes in Closed Doors, “the island breathed Greek, sang Greek”, is Greek, and will never be an empty space open to imperial or Other ethnic contamination.

The Turkish-cypriot nationalists also represent the ancestral journey and arrival to prove Turkey as Mother of Cyprus, and to confirm that Baby Cyprus is a Gift for the Turkish-cypriot. The nationalists capture spatial and social practices of a more recent Ottoman history, with emphasis on military displays of Ottoman soldiers’ blood in Cyprus. In these narratives, the Ottoman soldiers are central to the national building project, which reject Benedict Anderson’s claim that it is integral for the “Unknown Soldier” to remain un-identified in the nationalist project and imagination (1990, 9). Bryant refers to Anderson’s claims to argue that the Turkish-cyriots present a significant contrast, because their nationalist project is embedded with “the imagined recreation of [Ottoman] conquest and the specificity of lives” (2004, 211). The soldiers are always known and often named because their bodies and blood evidence the Ottoman creation of Cyprus.

In Yasin’s poetry collection, The Epic of the Bayraktar (1959) 1986), all of the poems are about evidencing the spatial and social practices of the Ottoman soldiers. In the poem, “The Epic of the Bayraktar”, Yasin writes about the Ottoman journey through focusing on the Bayraktar, the Ottoman soldier and flag bearer, who planted the flag on the Venetian walls of Nicosia to make Cyprus an Ottoman land.10 The opening of the poem focuses on experiences the Bayraktar had a night before conquest:

A golden crown on her head, the crescent and star on her breast  
And a red flag in her hand,  
She bent and kissed the Bayraktar’s forehead
“Victory is in your hands” she whispered (36)

The passage invokes a woman bearing objects of the Ottoman Empire – “crescent and star” of Islam, and “flag” of Empire – that comes to the Bayrakte, which is suggestive of a kind of Mother Ottoman, who gives the powerful objects to the Bayrakte, and directs him toward a journey to conquer Cyprus. This Mother, like the Spartan mothers in the EOKA leaflet, is a forceful figure who guides her son, the active agent, to go to battle. Another possibility is that the woman is Cyprus, a sensual seductive daughter luring the Bayrakte to come and make her an Ottoman Muslim, by giving him the objects through her breast, hand, kiss, and whisper. As a result of either the forceful Mother Ottoman or the alluring erotic Cyprus who directs through the objects, the Bayrakte sets out on the journey to do battle and conquer Cyprus:

The night 8 September 1570
In the morning the thoughts of the Bayrakte
[…]
Enough, this morning we will conquer Lefkosa
The hero howled and straightened up
[…]
Straightened Huseyin, straightened Hasan, straightened Mehmet
[…]
Osman falls, Mehmet falls, Bayrakte stands
[…]
Like a torrent, the Turkish army poured into the city
[…]
And the festival, the wedding started… (38)

The lines proclaim that the woman came to the Bayrakte a night before the conquest, which mobilized the Bayrakte to set out on 9 September 1570 to conquer Lefkosa. Following him were the Ottoman ancestors, all soldiers known and named – Huseyin, Hasan, Mehmet, Osman…—who fall, yet the Bayrakte goes on until he plants the Ottoman flag. Yasin represents the battle and fall of the Ottoman soldiers as a torrent that poured into the city to suggest the shedding of the Ottoman martyrs’ blood in the land – the blood military display – that is symbolized as a social practice, a “wedding”; this is the most dominant national narrative of Ottoman conquest. Bryant and Moira Killoran elaborate on this matrimony through using Carol Delaney’s (1991) observations on Turkish nationalism, where the nation is defined as active male seed inseminating the feminine soil, to read the Turkish-cypriot national project. Killoran confirms, “The land or soil which has been ‘inseminated’ by the blood of the fighters (martyrs) creates a national family that is not merely linked to the land, but is the land” (1998, 164); Bryant refers to “the joining together of these two entities [blood and land] in a form of matrimony” (2004, 200). Oguz Oksuzoglu’s poem “Like a Prayer” and Yasin’s play The Song of the Bayrakte are two of innumerable Turkish-cypriot narratives that represent such imagery:

Watered by the red blood
Of a hundred thousand martyrs
With its soil, with its stone
Cyprus full of Turkishness. (Oksuzoglu 1966, 9)

Gardener: From where did this holy flower get its colour?
Ozdemir: Look at what you’re thinking; there is a simple truth,
That colour is the blood of the martyrs who died for this land.
The heroes that conquered Lefkosa (Yasin 1959, 10)

Both passages show that the Ottoman martyrs masculine blood is imbued, “fertilises” and waters feminine Cyprus, and this is the marriage that procreates a Turkish land and Turkishness in Cyprus. Such imagery points to Cyprus as the fertile woman who procreates, which suggests Cyprus as the mother giving birth to Turkishness; however, the Mother continues to be Turkey because the substance that inseminates and creates Turkishness is the blood of Mother Ottoman’s sons, and so the
womb, or land, that receives the blood suggests that of a foreign daughter, who adopts her husband’s ethnicity to give birth to Turkishness. Thus, the foreign daughter is never depicted as mother proper, but only the adopted daughter or a surrogate womb for the birth of Turkish Cyprus.

It is this maternity that gave birth to Turkish Cyprus, and in “My Bayraktar” Yasin confirms this family lineage:

Is it not
Your grandchildren
Living
On this land
Is it not
120 thousand ([1959] 1986, 44)

Yasin demonstrates that the existence of Turkish-cypriots, who are the “grandchildren” of the Ottoman martyrs’ buried in Cyprus, not only confirms Ottoman-Turkish-cypriot kinship, but evidences Ottoman creation of Cyprus as historical-biological fact. This is considered a powerful fact to assert, as Ulucamgil writes to the Greek-cypriots in particular, “We are the grandchildren of your owners” ([1960-64]1989, 117).

All of Yasin’s poems in The Epic of the Bayraktar represent Ottoman spatial and social practices, particularly the history of how they came and left their “blood” and bodily mark, to uncover Turkish Cyprus as fact. To evidence further the Ottoman ancestors’ marks, the Turkish-cypriots associate Ottoman soldiers with place names in Cyprus. In “Cyprus” from the collection My Dear Cyprus ([1956] 1986), Yasin writes:

Oh the home of martyrs, this homeland.
Oh on every inch of your soil
Thousands of hidden memories.
In Magusa12: Tomb of Cambolat,
In Lefkosa: Bayraktar. (20)

Cyprus is validated as the martyrs’ homeland through naming Ottoman warriors and linking them with place names: “Cambolat” is linked to Magusa, because he is the Ottoman governor who led the Ottoman army during the siege of Magusa, and his tomb is stationed and celebrated there; Bayraktar is linked to Lefkosa, because it is here he planted the Ottoman flag and is buried. In contrast to Anderson’s claim, Yasin and the Turkish-cypriots commemorated these tombs precisely because they are full and they know that Cambolat and Bayraktar lay inside. Here, Yasin systematically proves and orders these places as Ottoman Turkish blood and bodily objects, where the linkage, like Angelides’ Teucer-Salamis, between Ottoman warrior name and place name represent Turkish-cypriot belonging and command in Cyprus. In this process Yasin and Angelides not only cleanse each other’s inscriptions from the land, but they also un-invent all inscriptions by different rulers and cultures that created Cyprus; together they empty Cyprus of its spatial history.

In “When You Suffer Without Turkey”, Ulucamgil writes to the Greek-cypriots and British rulers about this spatial act: “With its stone, its soil, its whole plain/It was not nameless, we ploughed” (1989, 125). Here Ulucamgil confirms that Cyprus is/was not a “nameless” space open to British and Greek contamination, but as a “whole” is a Turkish place eternally named by the Ottoman-Turkish soldiers. Ulucamgil compares this Ottoman naming to “ploughing” to suggest that the Ottoman soldiers “cut” out previous inscriptions and “turned over” the land to Ottoman-Turkishness. Here Ulucamgil is redefining conquest, whereby it is not a practice of military violence and coercion with weapons that desecrate the land, but a practice of farming and working, being a part and having an intimate attachment with the land through tools – pitchfork, spades and sickles – to bury nutrients – blood and body of soldiers – that nourish the soil. Thus, Ulucamgil plots Ottoman-Turkishness as a natural fact, and in “Fort”, he howls this fact to the British colonisers: “Tell that minister of colonisation/With what right did they settle in my homeland […] Tell them to read history/ Think history” ([1960-64]1989, 119), in attempts to educate the Brits, who are defined as ignorant of Ottoman essence in Cyprus.

Ulucamgil and Yasin read and construct Cyprus through showing awareness of spatial–Ottoman journey – and social practices – planting flags, maternity, ploughing – operating with
powerful blood, which prove Mother Ottoman-Turkey gave birth to Cyprus. The Turkish-cypriots are the offspring who have been entrusted, and have the duty to protect these ancestral gifts and the Gift of Cyprus; therefore, they call out, as Yasin states, “We will not give the ancestor’s gift” ([1958] 1986, 122) and “Turkishness won’t die/ Turkishness won’t die/In this island” ([1959] 1986, 44).

The Gift: Fetish Objects and Spectacles

Both Greek-cypriot and Turkish-cypriot narratives prove that the ancestors, mostly sons, of Mother Greece and Mother Ottoman-Turkey produced Cyprus. The writers prove this production through demonstrating knowledge and systematically ordering spatial and social practices into objects or spectacles imbued with blood or spiritual value, which gives way for Cyprus to be a blood or spiritual object or spectacle. Cyprus is thus a product of worship from the ancestors; it is the “Gift” of a Greek or Turkish place.

This nationalist reading and construction of Cyprus supports McClintock’s definition that “Nationalism inhabits the realm of fetishism”; it operates through organizing “fetish objects” (ships, flags, architectures) and “collective fetish spectacles” (ancient Greek or Ottoman journeys and military display) (1997, 102). This nation is created through organizing social and spatial practices – matrimony, procreation, language, journeys–into blood or spiritual fetish spectacles or objects; thus revealing the ways in which social space is transformed into abstract symbols and arcane substances, which are personified and projected onto the impassioned object and spectacle. In this way, the nationalist writers manipulate and master over concrete social practices, constructs and relations to transform Cyprus into a fetish spectacle and object.

McClintock’s theory of fetishism for nationalism can be enhanced through Lefebvre’s appropriation of Marx’s “commodity fetishism” (Marx, 1990) for spatial production. Marx explores “commodity fetishism” through associating it with religious practices of object worship, whereby the object of commodity is personified to the extent that it dictates the social relation that produced them. Lefebvre adopts Marx’s “commodity fetishism” to space, that is to say spaces are defined as objects of worship or fetish objects that manipulate and master the social practices and relations that produced them. Lefebvre’s definition of space as a commodity fetish provides an understanding of the ethnic motherland nationalists’ production of Cyprus. At first glance, it may be suggestive that the nationalists reveal the social relations, particularly the ancestral spatial practices coupled with the familial and maternal relations, which produced Cyprus. It is clear, however, that this process is based on manipulating and mastering the actual social relations and directly lived experiences of the people and former inhabitants that created the island, wherein the concept of production –Who produces? How? Why? For whom? – does not become fully concrete but remains purely and powerfully abstract (Lefebvre, 69); thus, enabling the unanswerable and unquestionable production of Cyprus as an ethnically pure or powerful complete object.

This production of Cyprus as a complete object is further enhanced through Tuan’s exploration of place: “Objects and places are centres of value […] [place, like an object,] achieves concrete reality when our experience of it is total” (71). Here Tuan focuses on the child’s experience with place as a type of object, where the child’s primary place, which is simultaneously referred to as the first enduring object, is the mother, and as the child grows they become attached to other places—family members, toys, or a specific location like the naughty step— that are experienced as objects of value because they are considered gifts from the mother. This childhood experience speaks directly to the ethnic motherland nationalist production, by which the writers manipulate and master actual childhood experiences and relations within and for the creation of place. The nationalists depict Cyprus and its people as the child, whose initial place or object of worship is Mother Greece or Mother Turkey. Subsequently Cyprus and the child are attached to an array of objects – flags, ships, tombs etc. – that define and are defined as places or objects of worship because they are gifts from the Mothers. This process gives way for Cyprus to be depicted and experienced as the object or Gift from Mother Turkey or Mother Greece to the people who will perpetually be babies of this baby nation.

Hermaphrodite Conclusion

12
The ethnic motherland nationalist identity is determined by the production of Cyprus, which is built on the foundation of competing narratives in spatial solidarity. Both nationalist literatures are loaded with readings and constructions, which attempt to prove the production of an ethnically closed concrete place or Gift. The maternal abstractions capture Turkey and Greece as Mothers and Cyprus as Baby, and the ancestral journey and arrival, which operates with blood or spiritual objects and spectacles, evidence the Mothers as agents who gave birth to Baby Cyprus, who created the Gift.

This examination of the nationalist production of Cyprus gives way to truths, particularly Lefebvre’s “truth of space” (397-400), which expose problems, contradictions and paradox. The writers attempt to create a place through capturing intimate attachments and detailed knowledge of maternal and ancestral spatial and social practices, yet these practices are based on manipulating directly lived and perceived experiences through the conceived; thus, a dialectic between concrete reality and mental abstractions, where the latter masters, reduces, secretes and appropriates the former, particularly through a gendered process of production. This gendered process of production makes and breaks the national project. It is a crucial device to make fact the deep familial kinship between the ethnic centres and Cyprus, biologically and historically proving the Mothers gave birth to Baby Cyprus, and validating the Turkish-cypriots or Greek-cypriots as the offspring who must protect the ethnic Gift. It is a device that filters who is “included” and “excluded” from the national project, and that confirms Cyprus was not an empty space open to British imperial or Other ethnic contamination, but an ethnically cleansed, complete and closed place. This national device moved the masses and mobilized the anti-colonial campaign to be dictated, to kill and to die for the mental construction and preservation of this Baby Gift. The gendered process of production simultaneously breaks this national project, exposing not only the spatial solidarity between the ethnically divided people of Cyprus, but most significantly exposing Cyprus not as a complete closed place but a shifting ground, represented as a baby, heroic son, and luring daughter –a Hermaphrodite Cyprus that the children of Cyprus and this world must protect and preserve.
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I use Paul Gilroy’s (2011) and Stuart Hall’s (1990) approach to identity as identification, which makes a nonsense of the fixed term “identity”; it is a process that is never complete, always in operation within and through the names we give to different ways we position ourselves. I address this operation through Raymond William’s (1977) model of cultural analysis proposed in “Dominant, Residual and Emergent” and “Structure of Feeling”.

Montis and Angelides wrote in Greek, and the analysed texts have been read in English translation. Yasin and Ulucamgil wrote in Turkish, and the analysed texts have been read in Turkish and translated into English by me.

Some may claim TMT is not an anti-colonial movement because it was not founded to remove British rule; Turkish-cypriots preferred British colonialism over EOKA’s enosis, considered Greek colonialism; British and Turkish-cypriots, as claimed by Greek-cypriot nationalists, collaborated. Though the anti-Greek sentiment dominated over the anti-British one, TMT’s plan was always to remove the British because, as Ismail Tansu states, they prevented Turkey’s involvement, leaving Turkish-cypriots without taksim and at the mercy of the British who treated them like second class citizens (2007, 19).

On dominant narratives see Papadakis 2008; Gazioglu 2000; Tansu 2007; Vanezis, 1971.

A modus operandi proposed by Marx (1993), which informed Lefebvre’s work and he argued should inform and be used by all researchers and people; it informs my work and provides an understanding of nationalist production of Cyprus. The approach is movement, starting from the present, working our way to the past, then retracing our steps to the yet-to-be; acting retroactively upon the past, disclosing it to appear in a different light, and the process whereby that past becomes the present also takes on another aspect. (Lefebvre, 65-67).

open zone is a term I use for the colonial and postcolonial inventions of place, or in Tuan’s terms open “space”. This includes for example: Franz Fanon’s “zone of occult instability” (2001, 183); Graham Huggan’s “rhizomatic (open)” (1989, 126); Paul Carter’s “spatial history” (1987); Homi Bhabha’s “hybridity and difference” (1994); Arjun Appadurai’s “disjuncture” and “number games” (1996); Gyan Pandey’s multiple partitions (2002).

EOKA officially mobilized on 1 April 1955; here Montis is acknowledging the date EOKA was founded.

The Bayraktar is the only soldier who is not named; however, the specificities of his conquest, life, and tomb in Nicosia are always known.

Places in Cyprus are subject to a name game often operating between Turkish, Greek and English names. The capital is “Lefkos[h]a” in Turkish, “Lefkosia” in Greek, and “Nicosia” in English. Here I have not translated the capital to the English equivalent because such remapping would defeat the writers’ objective.

“Gazi-Magusa” in Turkish, “Ammohostos” in Greek, and “Famagusta” in English.